DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 408 VT 008 866

Volunteers Look at Corrections.
Harris (Louis) and Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Spons Agency-Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Feb 69
Note-37p.
Available from-Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1522 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 ($1.00)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.95
Descriptors-Attitudes, Community Services, *Correctional Rehabilitation, Corrective Institutions, Individual Characteristics, *National Surveys, Opinions, *Volunteers
Identifiers-Joint Commission Correctional Manpower & Training

A randomly selected sample of 541 volunteers representing the various kinds of corrections agencies were interviewed to determine attitudes toward the correctional system. The major sections of the report represent the four substantive areas examined: (1) Who are the Volunteers?, (2) Why Are They Volunteers, (3) Volunteer Work in the Correctional Agency, and (4) Attitudes Toward Volunteer Work in the Correctional Agency. Some highlights were: (1) Volunteers were younger and better educated than the general adult public, (2) About half of the volunteers were women, but Negroes were underrepresented, (3) Volunteers offered their services (in order of decreasing importance) because of a desire to help others, a recognition of need and a sense of obligation to serve, and anticipated personal benefits, (4) Volunteers emphasized the relationship of social conditions to crime and delinquency, (5) There was indication of overconfidence and insensitivity to the inherent problems of corrections situations, (6) There was evidence of passivity on the part of corrections agencies in terms of recruiting, screening, and training, (7) Field agencies and adult institutions have the highest volunteer participation, and (8) nine in ten volunteers rate cooperation between themselves and the professional staff as "usually good". (JK)

VT008866

ED032408

JOINT COMMISSION ON CORRESPONDENCE
MANPOWER AND TRAINING

CORRESPONDENCE IN YOUR JOB

(2)

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, incorporated in the District of Columbia, consists of nearly a hundred national, international, and regional organizations and public agencies which have joined together to attack one of the serious social problems of our day: How to secure enough trained men and women to bring about the rehabilitation of offenders through our correctional systems and thus prevent further delinquency and crime.

Recognizing the importance of this problem, the Congress in 1965 passed the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act, which authorized grants through the Social and Rehabilitation Service for a broad study of correctional manpower and training. The Joint Commission is funded under this Act and through grants from private foundations, organizations, and individuals.

Commission publications available:

***Differences That Make the Difference*, papers of a seminar on implications of cultural differences for corrections. August 1967. 64 pp.**

***Targets for In-Service Training*, papers of a seminar on in-service training. October 1967. 68 pp.**

***Research in Correctional Rehabilitation*, report of a seminar on research in correctional rehabilitation. December 1967. 70 pp.**

***The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections*, report of a public opinion survey. February 1968. 28 pp.**

***The Future of the Juvenile Court: Implications for Correctional Manpower and Training*, consultants' paper. June 1968. 67 pp.**

***Offenders as a Correctional Manpower Resource*, papers of a seminar on the use of offenders in corrections. July 1968. 103 pp.**

***Criminology and Corrections Programs: A Study of the Issues*, report of a seminar. July 1968. 101 pp.**

***Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change*, report of an attitude survey. August 1968. 45 pp.**

***The University and Corrections: Potential for Collaborative Relationships*, consultant's paper. January 1969. 78 pp.**

***Volunteers Look at Corrections*, report of an attitude survey. February 1969. 29 pp.**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VOLUNTEERS LOOK AT CORRECTIONS

Report of a Survey
made by
Louis Harris and Associates

for the

JOINT COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND TRAINING
1522 K Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20005
February 1969

This study was made possible, in part,
by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

FOREWORD

THIS REPORT is the third in a series of opinion surveys published by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training. The first report, *The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections* (February 1968) dealt with three areas: general attitudes of the public towards corrections and rehabilitation of the offender, feelings about contacts with convicted offenders on their return to the community, and opinions about corrections as a career. The second opinion survey, published under the title *Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change* (August 1968) focused on the attitudes of the correctional worker towards the system of criminal justice —law enforcement, courts, and corrections; his education and training as preparation for his present job; and his attitudes toward his job, his fellow workers, and his agency or institution. While these two surveys provided significant insights into many aspects of the manpower and training problems of corrections, the information gathered would be incomplete without a similar opinion survey of the volunteer worker in corrections.

The volunteer's importance both as a manpower source and as an ally in correctional programming was emphasized in the report of the corrections task force of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Yet correctional administrators remain divided on the value of the volunteer for the correctional agency as well as on the question of the most appropriate role and function of the volunteer in the correctional program. Corrections, therefore, has not developed either for itself or for the guidance of the volunteer a clearly defined policy with respect to the recruitment, training, or utilization of volunteers.

These are fundamental policy issues. An opinion survey of this kind may serve to reveal some of the dimensions of such issues. It cannot resolve them. Furthermore, this opinion survey was not designed to measure the relative merits of different kinds of volunteer programs. Neither is it an attempt to compare correctional agencies which use volunteers with those that do not. Basically, it is a companion piece to the other two opinion surveys conducted by Louis Harris and Associates and therefore similar in design and method.

The volunteer in corrections is at best an elusive target. Even more elusive is the volunteer dropout who could not be interviewed but whose opinions might have significantly altered the results of this survey. Nevertheless, the collective opinions of 541 volunteers across the country working in four different correctional settings represent a sizable body of opinion which needs to be taken into account as more effective correctional manpower policies are delineated.

The Joint Commission is grateful to this large group of people not only for their cooperation in making this report possible but more importantly for their interest in the correctional agencies which they serve.

Acknowledgments are due to Keith A. Stubblefield, task force director, who worked closely with the staff of Louis Harris and Associates in planning this survey and prepared the chapter on implications of the findings, and to Roma K. McNickle who edited the report and supervised the design and printing of the publication.

GARRETT HEYNS
Executive Director

CONTENTS

I. WHY AND HOW THIS STUDY WAS MADE 1
II. HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FINDINGS 3
III. WHO ARE THE VOLUNTEERS? 6
IV. WHY ARE THEY VOLUNTEERS? 9
V. VOLUNTEER WORK IN CORRECTIONAL AGENCIES 14
VI. VOLUNTEERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD WORK IN CORRECTIONS 20
VII. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY FOR CORRECTIONS 26
APPENDIX 29

CHAPTER I

WHY AND HOW THIS STUDY WAS MADE

THE FOLLOWING five chapters present the results of a national survey of volunteers working in correctional agencies which was conducted by Louis Harris and Associates for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training in the summer of 1968.

For purposes of the survey, a volunteer was defined as a member of the community who offers his services to the correctional agency without payment, although he may be reimbursed for some out-of-pocket expenses. Almost all volunteers work on a part-time basis. Their skills vary from the simplest to the most technical and complex.

Two earlier studies made for the Joint Commission by Louis Harris and Associates had touched on the use of volunteers in the correctional process. The first study, published by the Joint Commission in February 1968 as *The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections*, found that over one in ten of the adults interviewed would be willing to volunteer in various aspects of correctional work if they were asked.

The second survey, published by the Joint Commission in August 1968 as *Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change*, found that volunteers are used in only about one-third of the correctional agencies in the country, where they are highly regarded and apparently would be welcome in increased numbers. But in the majority of agencies that do not have volunteer programs, there is little support for introducing them.

Substantive Areas of the Study

The present study deals with the volunteers themselves. It examines their attitudes toward and involvement with the correctional system.

Four substantive areas were examined.

- Who are the volunteers?
- Why are they volunteers?
- Volunteer work in the correctional agency.
- Attitudes toward volunteer work in the correctional agency.

Specifics of these areas are listed in the appendix.

How the Survey Was Conducted

Information collected by the Joint Commission in its baseline surveys of correctional agencies identified those which had volunteer programs at the time of the survey in early 1967 and how large these programs were.

On the basis of this information, the sample for this survey was selected, using much the same procedure as was followed in the survey of correctional personnel.

Agencies were randomly chosen in each of seven areas:

- State and federal adult institutions
- State and federal juvenile institutions
- Local probation agencies (county-level in most cases)
- State-level agencies for probation only
- State-level probation and parole agencies
- State-level agencies for parole only
- Volunteer courts—courts which systematically use volunteers to provide all or most probation services. Most volunteer courts in this survey were municipal courts, though a few had city-county jurisdiction.

Once the specific agencies had been selected, the Joint Commission staff contacted those individuals responsible for the volunteer program, explaining the purpose of the survey and asking for permission to conduct interviewing in the agency.

Agencies were asked to prepare a roster of all active volunteers. From this roster the interviewer was to make a random selection (using a random number table) of a specified number of respondents. The use of this procedure was intended to prevent both the interviewer and the agency personnel from biasing the choice of volunteers to be interviewed.

Significant difficulties were encountered when the actual field work began. Just about one-third of the original 120 agencies which had been selected had to be replaced in the sampling plan. In almost every case the substitution was necessary because the agency turned out to have no real volunteer program. In some of these agencies there were no volunteers at all, and in others there was only a handful of individuals who volunteered their services at sporadic intervals.

In practically every case when a substitution was required, the replacement was randomly chosen within the same type of setting and region of the country as the original selection. For example, when

an adult institution in the Midwest was eliminated, it was replaced with another adult institution in the Midwest. As a result of this process of substitution, the final sample was almost completely composed of agencies which have ongoing volunteer programs. In any case, whether or not one would want to say that the agency had an ongoing volunteer program, every individual interviewed was actually a volunteer.

At the beginning of the interview each respondent was assured that his name and the agency in which he was working would be held in the strictest confidence by Louis Harris and Associates and that all results would be presented in group terms precluding any individual identification.

Interviews, which ranged in length from 30 to 60 minutes, were completed with 541 volunteers.

In analyzing the interviews, responses were grouped into four categories according to the correctional setting in which the volunteers were working.

Adult institutions (30)—152 volunteers
Juvenile institutions (30)—143 volunteers
Field settings (probation and parole agencies, both adult and juvenile) (35)—184 volunteers, the majority of them working in juvenile settings
Volunteer courts, both adult and juvenile (15)—62 volunteers, most of them working with juveniles

Further analysis was made on the basis of age, sex, education, and occupation. Definitions and sizes of these categories appear in the Appendix.

Organization of the Report

Chapter II presents a brief summary of the findings, which highlights the most significant conclusions to be drawn from the data. It serves also as a guide to the fuller presentations of information in the four substantive areas, to be found in Chapters III through VI. The "observations" which appear in Chapters III through VI are those of the Louis Harris staff. Chapter VII presents implications for corrections drawn from the report by the Joint Commission staff.

USING THE TABLES IN THIS REPORT

Unless otherwise indicated, the tables are based on data from the total number of interviews.

Nineteen of the 541 persons interviewed were under 21 years of age and are included in the "under 35" bracket in tables relating solely to volunteers. However, when comparison is made to the general adult population of 21 and over, the 19 volunteers below this age are included in the 21-to-34 bracket.

CHAPTER II

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FINDINGS

Who Are the Volunteers?

AN EXAMINATION of the characteristics of the volunteers reveals factors which identify and make this group unique. This information can be useful if corrections wishes to recruit volunteers efficiently. Also, if characteristic differences between correctional personnel and volunteers are noted, some of the potential problems of volunteer programs may be anticipated.

The volunteers tend to be somewhat younger than both the general adult public and correctional personnel. The younger volunteers tend to gravitate toward work in juvenile institutions.

Just about half of the volunteers are women, although there are sharp variations by type of setting—more men in adult institutions and volunteer courts, more women in juvenile institutions and field agencies. The proportion of men among correctional personnel is larger than among volunteers, since almost nine out of ten correctional personnel are men.

Age and sex differences between volunteers and correctional personnel point to sources of possible conflict between the two groups. A positive implication of these differences is that the nature of correctional work can make a greater appeal than it now does to women and to younger individuals.

Volunteers reflect the country's religious distribution almost exactly. In terms of racial distribution, Negroes are underrepresented compared to the adult public.

The volunteers, as a group, are much better educated than the general public, but a smaller proportion of them than of correctional personnel (excluding line workers) are college graduates.

The volunteers have a higher proportion of professionals (doctors, lawyers, etc.) and a lower proportion of blue-collar workers than does the labor force. As might be expected from higher education and better jobs, the family income of the volunteers is significantly higher than that of the general public.

A large proportion of volunteers belong to some type of community organization. One in five belong to two or more such organizations.

The characteristics of the volunteers indicate they are a unique group, differentiated from the three groups with whom they are in contact—offenders, correctional personnel, and the general community.

In dealing with offenders and correctional personnel, these differences may make it more difficult for volunteers to be accepted into and involved with the system. However, the differences also permit them to bring a fresh perspective to corrections and possibly suggest new approaches which may be more difficult to generate from within the system.

The volunteers' education, occupation, and income may well place them in or near positions of leadership in the community where they can serve as spokesmen for the needs and problems of correctional agencies. The negative implication of these differences from the total community is that volunteerism is still an activity of the elite. Were the volunteers to be a more representative cross-section of the community, their impact on the offender might be greater.

Why They Are Volunteers

For just over 50 percent, their present work in the correctional agency is their first volunteer experience. Less than one in five have had any previous experience in corrections. Half are currently involved in other volunteer work outside the correctional agency.

Over one in three have been doing volunteer work of any kind for two years or less. Almost six in ten have been engaged in correctional volunteer work for two years or less.

When asked why they became volunteers, almost everyone replied that he found the work interesting. Obviously, individuals would be unlikely to volunteer for work they did not find of interest. In addition, three groups of reasons were offered. In order of decreasing importance they are:

- A desire to help others.
- A recognition of the need for volunteers and a sense of obligation to serve.
- Anticipated personal benefits.

Since the correctional field is anxious to increase public involvement in the correctional process, it should take note that a desire to help others is expressed in the twin goals of service to other individuals and service to the community.

The volunteers believe they have "something special" to offer the offender—contact without the barrier of authority, personal interest, and dedica-

tion—and that they are not needed simply because there are not enough professionals.

Volunteers are more apt than correctional personnel to emphasize social conditions rather than personality problems as the major reason why most people become criminals or delinquents. Their work, volunteers believe, helps to deal with this problem and, as a result, improves the whole community. By being more willing than correctional personnel to lay the responsibility for the offender's behavior on society's doorstep, the volunteer in some ways is better suited to serve as the offender's advocate in the community.

One of the problems of employing volunteers is that they are, in certain respects, overconfident. Only one in three of those interviewed had any concern about doing correctional volunteer work. To enter without concern a correctional setting where human relations are so subtly balanced and potentially unstable is to be insensitive to the inherent problems of such a situation. This insensitivity can easily create more difficulties than the volunteer's warmth, dedication, and desire to help can solve.

Volunteer Work in the Correctional Agency

Volunteers received their first information about the agency from a variety of sources, most of which do not appear to have been directly related to the specific agency. Only 31 percent of the volunteers said the agency made the initial contact.

Screening of volunteers appears somewhat casual, with only 41 percent interviewed by someone at the agency, 25 percent asked to provide written information about themselves, and 18 percent asked to give references.

Only 15 percent of the volunteers indicated they had to satisfy any "education, experience, or other requirements" before they were accepted into the agency.

These statistics indicate that corrections, at least in the initial phases of contact, appears to be the passive partner in its relation with the volunteers.

The median length of time volunteers have been with the agency is 1.6 years. More than half of the volunteers come to the agency at least once a week, and the median stay on each visit is 2.7 hours. Field agencies and adult institutions appear to have the highest intensity of volunteer participation, volunteer courts the lowest, with juvenile institutions in between.

Only half of the volunteers received any initial orientation and training, another sign of the field's passivity. In those agencies which do have orientation programs, they appear to be quite thorough and, for most volunteers, provide an accurate picture of what they will be doing in the agency.

Almost nine in ten volunteers work directly with the offender. Their jobs cover a wide range of activities. In institutional settings at least 25 percent are engaged in each of the following:

Self-improvement programs
Guidance, counseling, testing
Recreational activities
Sponsorship-visitation

Counseling by volunteers appears to take place significantly more often in adult institutions than in juvenile institutions. Emphasis on recreational entertainment and on arts and crafts activities is far heavier in juvenile institutions than in adult institutions.

In field settings, over half of the volunteers are involved in counseling, guidance, and testing; about three in ten in probation-parole sponsorship; and just over one in four in both recreational activities and volunteer probation-parole duties.

Most of the volunteers indicated that they had had an opportunity to select the kind of work they are doing and that they feel their job is clearly defined.

While volunteer work covers a wide range of activities, only one in five indicated they had received any training for their current job, a proportion that is certainly too low.

Among the large majority who have not received any training, two out of three feel that such training would be unnecessary. This appears to be at least partly a mark of the volunteers' overconfidence and not a realistic estimate of their own competence.

The supervisory structure is clear to the volunteers. Over eight in ten said there is one person to whom they report. However, the supervisor is usually a staff member with duties other than volunteer coordination. Only 16 percent indicated they have a supervisor whose sole responsibility is the volunteer program. Only one in four said they had ever been formally evaluated by a staff member in the agency. This appears remarkably low, especially since half of the volunteers have been at the agency for more than 18 months.

The low levels of orientation, job training, and evaluation make the following conclusion obvious: Most correctional agencies have not made a real commitment to their volunteer programs.

Attitudes toward Volunteer Work in a Correctional Agency

Like correctional personnel, volunteers see "rehabilitation of the offender" as the current major goal of the agency. However, they give more weight to "changing community attitudes" and also to "punishment" as important goals and less weight to "protection of society" than do the correctional personnel.

In terms of what *should* be the goals, "rehabilitation" is still seen as most important, followed by "changing community attitudes" and "protection of society." It is particularly interesting that volunteers place a good deal more emphasis than correctional personnel on "changing community attitudes."

In spite of the lack of agency commitment, volunteers generally have an extremely favorable attitude toward their program. To some extent, a positive attitude is insured by the fact that the respondents, as volunteers, are freely offering their services and, if dissatisfied, would be working elsewhere. Nevertheless, the degree of satisfaction is impressive.

Four in ten rate their volunteer program "excellent" and over eight in ten rate it as either "excellent" or "pretty good." Generally, the program is considered well-organized, although there is explicit criticism in this area by one in ten, and over half of the volunteers expressed an opinion implying that there was room for organizational improvement.

This criticism does not prevent the volunteers from giving their supervisor a strong positive rating. Only 16 percent feel they have too little supervision.

Relations with the staff are also viewed favorably. Almost nine in ten said there is "usually good" cooperation between them and the professional staff.

Most of the volunteers feel that if they had an idea or suggestion for improvement they would have a very good chance of having this proposal presented to and discussed by the staff. The volunteers also believe they know what is going on in their agency. Only one in five said they feel like outsiders.

Large majorities feel their work is interesting, important, and appreciated by both staff and offenders. Most believe that none or only a few of the volunteers are disappointed with the kinds of things they are doing in the agency.

Although they have few negative things to say about the agency, almost half of the volunteers do believe they could be used more effectively.

Finally, the volunteers indicate that they view corrections with a new appreciation as a result of their participation, that their attitude has become more favorable since they began their volunteer work, and that they have interested others in possibly becoming volunteers.

CHAPTER III

WHO ARE THE VOLUNTEERS?

A PREVIOUS study found that one of the major movements in current correctional thinking focuses on the need for greater community involvement in the correctional process.[1] The use of volunteers is one way of encouraging such involvement, and recruitment can be made more efficient if corrections has some idea of the groups in the population that appear to be the best source of volunteers. Therefore, before exploring the attitudes of the volunteers and their participation in the correctional process, it may be useful to see how this group is distinguished from the general adult population as well as from the correctional community in which they are working.

Age and Sex

Volunteers tend to be somewhat younger than either the adult population or correctional personnel. The younger volunteers are most prevalent in juvenile institutions and volunteer courts.

Overall, there are more women among volunteers than among correctional personnel, where nearly nine out of ten workers are men. However, the sex distribution of volunteers varies sharply from setting to setting. In adult institutions, over eight in ten volunteers are men, as compared with less than four in ten volunteers working in field agencies and juvenile institutions.

Observation: Two contrary conclusions may be drawn from data on age and sex of volunteers.

The fact that there are more young people and more women among them than among correctional personnel is encouraging. It suggests that corrections can appeal (in terms of the substance of the work) to these groups which are now underrepresented among correctional personnel.

On the other hand, just because volunteers are younger and there are more women among them, there is a potential for conflict. The volunteers want to serve, but correctional personnel may be somewhat reluctant to give them the opportunity or responsibility.

The results of this survey do not indicate that this is a serious problem in the agencies in which volunteers were interviewed. However, it may be a partial explanation of the widespread reluctance on the part of correctional personnel to advocate the use of volunteers.

1. Age and sex of volunteers, adult public, and correctional personnel.

	Volunteers					Population 21 years and over [1]	Correctional personnel [2]
	Total	Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Age							
21 to 34 [3]	35	25	44	34	42	26	25
35 to 49	40	42	36	43	37	30	45
50 and over	25	33	20	23	21	44	30
Sex							
Male	53	83	37	39	55	49	88
Female	47	17	63	61	45	51	12

[1] *Data from national survey conducted by Louis Harris and Associates in 1968.*

[2] *Data from Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training,* Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change *(Washington: The Commission, 1968), pp. 27-28. (Publication cited in subsequent tables by title only.)*

[3] *See note on Using the Tables in This Report, p. 2.*

Race

The study of correctional personnel found that Negroes form a smaller proportion of correctional personnel (8 percent) than of the adult public. But Negroes form only 4 percent of volunteers.

2. Racial composition of the adult population, correctional personnel, and volunteers.

Race	Population 21 years of age and over [1]	Correctional personnel [2]	Volunteers
	%	%	%
White	89.6	92	95
Negro	9.4	8	4
Other	1.0	**	1

**Less than 0.5 percent.

[1] *U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Estimates of the Population of Voting Age for States: November 1, 1968,"* Current Population Reports, *Series P-25, No. 406 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 2. Includes persons 18 to 20 years of age in Georgia and Kentucky, 19 and 20 in Alaska, and 20 in Hawaii.*

[2] Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, *p. 28.*

[1] Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change* (Washington: The Commission, 1968), pp. 16-22, 43.

Education

Volunteers are better educated than the adult public. Just about half (48 percent) of the volunteers have graduated from college, as compared with only one in ten of the population aged 25 years or more.

It may be noted, however, that volunteers as a whole have less graduate education than do the correctional personnel with whom a good many volunteers work. This is particularly true of the correctional specialists—teachers, probation and parole officers, counselors, psychologists, social workers, and similar personnel.

Among college-educated volunteers, education is the largest single degree field.

Master's degrees held by volunteers are, again, in education and to a lesser degree in social work and religion.

3. Education of volunteers, adult population, and correctional personnel.

Highest educational attainment	Volunteers working in—					Population 25 years and over [1]	Correctional personnel [2]			
	Total	Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts		Administrator	Supervisor	Specialist	Line worker
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
11th grade or less	6	8	9	4	7	49	1	5	1	16
High school graduate	20	16	22	23	16	32	9	13	5	52
1-3 years college	26	26	22	29	25	9	11	12	11	25
College graduate	24	20	28	24	20	10	22	25	40	3
Some graduate school	10	10	11	11	9	NA	25	21	27	3
Master's degree	10	14	5	8	17	NA	28	23	15	1
Doctor's degree	4	6	3	1	6	NA	4	1	1	–

NA—Not available.
[1] *U.S. Bureau of the Census,* Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1968 *(Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 110.*
[2] Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, *p. 28.*

4. Fields in which volunteers and correctional personnel took bachelor's degrees.

Bachelor's degree field	Volunteers working in—					Correctional personnel [1]
	Total	Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Education	19	9	20	25	24	16
Sociology	10	9	10	9	16	21
Business and public administration	9	12	9	9	–	5
Religion	5	11	–	6	–	–
Psychology	3	–	2	6	8	14
Social work	2	–	2	3	–	4
Other	52	59	57	42	52	40

Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, *p. 29.*

Occupation and Income

Just about seven in ten of the volunteers are currently employed or in school.

Blue-collar workers account for only a small proportion of volunteers. One in four volunteers are professionals, a significantly higher proportion than among the labor force.

More education and more professional and executive jobs mean higher than average income for the volunteer group. Over six in ten (61 percent) of the volunteers are members of families with incomes of $10,000 or more a year. Less than three out of ten American families have incomes of this size, according to a national survey conducted in 1968 by Louis Harris and Associates.

5. Occupations of volunteers.

	Total	Men	Women
	%	%	%
Employment status:			
Wage worker	8	9	6
Salaried worker	44	60	27
Self-employed	15	24	6
Retired	3	3	4
Housewife	26	–	54
Student	2	1	3
Other	2	3	–
Occupations of employed and retired persons:			
Professionals	25	35	13
Executives	10	16	4
Writers, artists, other creative personnel	3	3	2
Sales workers	6	10	1
Other white-collar workers	13	15	11
Blue-collar workers	7	8	3
Other	6	9	9

	Volunteers %	*U.S. families* %
Under $5,000	9	28
$5,000 to $9,999	30	44
$10,000 to $14,999	37	28
$15,000 and over	24	

Religion

Volunteers reflect very closely the religious composition of the adult population as shown in the Louis Harris national survey of 1968.

	Volunteers	*Population aged 21 and over*
	%	%
Protestant	67	66
Catholic	20	27
Jewish	7	3
Other	5	2
No religion	1	2

Organizational Affiliation

Like most other Americans, volunteers are joiners. One in four (24 percent) belong to two or more organizations.

Volunteers working through volunteer courts are most likely to belong to an organization, while those in juvenile institutions show the lowest membership proportion.

Memberships in fraternal orders (such as the Masons and Knights of Columbus) and service organizations (such as Rotary and the Chamber of Commerce) were most frequently reported by volunteers interviewed. One-fourth of those who reported belonging to an organization mentioned a church or other religious group.

General Observation: This is an admittedly brief sketch of some of the characteristics of the volunteers. But it is enough to point up their uniqueness as a group and their difference from the three groups with whom they are in contact—offenders, correctional personnel, and the general community.

These differences have both positive and negative implications. The positives are these:

—In working with offenders and correctional personnel, the volunteers confront a system with which most of them are unfamiliar. Acceptance and involvement may be difficult. But at the same time volunteers can bring a freshness and variety of approach and experience to correctional work which may be more difficult for those within the system to generate. Their differences, their unfamiliarity are thus working both for and against the volunteers' success in correctional work.

—Particularly in terms of education, occupation, and income, the volunteers stand out from the total community. Their advantage in these areas is likely to place them in or near positions of leadership in the community. If they can gain a sympathetic understanding of the correctional process, they can serve as articulate spokesmen in the community for the needs and problems of correctional agencies.

But it is also true that effective public participation requires a more representative group from the community. Volunteerism has been, and apparently still is, the preserve of the elite. The offender can benefit from this contact, but there is certainly as much benefit from this contact with people he is likely to be dealing with on a day-to-day basis when he is released. As we will see in a later section, correctional agencies usually do not take the initiative in seeking out volunteers. As long as this is the case, the elite will represent the major proportion of volunteers. Not until volunteers are actively recruited is this situation likely to change.

CHAPTER IV

WHY ARE THEY VOLUNTEERS?

FOR JUST OVER HALF of the respondents, their work with a correctional agency is their first volunteer experience. The 48 percent who have had other volunteer experience have worked in a wide variety of areas, some in several kinds of programs.

	Percent		*Percent*
Church	47	Other corrections	19
Youth work	37	Social welfare	17
Community work	35	Community corrections agencies	16
Hospital	28	Poverty programs	8
School	28	Other	14
Fund-raising	19		

One in three of those with previous volunteer experience have been involved in correctional work —19 percent in other correctional agencies than those where they are now working and 16 percent with community agencies which are concerned in part with corrections.

In addition to their current work in a correctional agency, half of those interviewed were also involved in other volunteer work.

	Percent of all volunteers
In concurrent volunteer work	49
Volunteers working in:	
Adult institutions	53
Juvenile institutions	45
Field agencies	46
Volunteer courts	58
Education:	
High school or less	43
College	48
Postgraduate	58
Sex:	
Men	51
Women	47
Age:	
Under 35	41
35-49	60
50 and over	44

6. Length of service in any type of volunteer work.

Length of service	Volunteers now working in—					Age of volunteers		
	Total	Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts	Under 35	35 to 49	50 and over
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Under 1 year	18	17	23	14	18	34	12	7
1 year-2 years	18	12	21	19	22	25	14	13
3 years-4 years	17	13	16	21	13	17	17	14
5 years-6 years	10	17	4	9	10	7	12	12
7 years-10 years	10	10	10	9	12	10	13	5
More than 10 years	27	31	26	28	25	7	32	49

7. Length of volunteer service in corrections.

Length of service	Volunteers working in—					Age of volunteers		
	Total	Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts	Under 35	35 to 49	50 and over
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Under 1 year	33	27	39	35	33	51	25	17
1 year-2 years	25	21	25	23	37	29	24	20
3 years-4 years	18	18	18	21	10	15	23	16
5 years-6 years	9	13	8	8	7	2	12	17
7 years-10 years	6	7	4	6	4	2	7	9
More than 10 years	9	14	6	8	9	1	9	21

Individuals working in volunteer courts, those who have done graduate work, and the 35-49 age group are most likely to be doing other volunteer work. Activity in church or other religious volunteer programs is most common, involving about one-third of those reporting concurrent volunteer work. Community service programs (9 percent), hospital and medical programs (8 percent), and youth work (6 percent) follow in order of frequency.

For the total group, over half have been doing volunteer work for less than 5 years. One in four have been volunteers for 10 years or more.
Individuals now working in adult institutions have been doing volunteer work somewhat longer than those now working elsewhere in corrections. Age is obviously an important factor in length of volunteer service, with half of the volunteers aged 50 or over having been volunteers for 10 years or more.

In correctional volunteer work, length of service is less, with almost six in ten indicating that they have been volunteers in corrections for 2 years or less. Only among those in adult institutions have a majority been correctional volunteers for more than 2 years.

Observation: Unfortunately, we do not have any comparable national results for volunteers doing work in other areas (although such results may be available) and cannot make any determination as to whether correctional volunteers are more or less experienced than volunteers in other areas.

The picture, as one might expect, is mixed, with half relatively new to the field and half more experienced.

Reasons for Volunteering

Although there is an apparently wide range of correctional experience among volunteers, particularly in terms of length of service, there do not appear to be any significant attitudinal differences based on this experience. We had initially planned to use length of service as an analytic dimension, but an examination of the data indicated that it was not a particularly discriminating factor. It is possible to explain this lack of difference in two ways. One can say either that volunteers do not appear to learn from their experiences, or one can say that they do not appear to become jaded by their experiences. We lean to the second explanation. There is a deep sense of altruism and social awareness

8. Reasons for becoming a volunteer in corrections.

	"Very important" reasons [1]												"Most important" reasons [2]
		Volunteers working in—				Education of volunteers			Sex of volunteers		Age of volunteers			
	Total	Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts	High School	College	Post graduate	Men	Women	Under 35	35-49	50 & over	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Find work very interesting	79	83	80	77	75	83	83	67	77	81	80	78	79	29
Feel real need to help others	72	74	77	73	54	80	74	60	70	74	67	73	77	54
Like being with other people	61	64	68	54	55	69	62	50	56	66	58	60	65	16
Help make this a better community	57	64	57	55	52	64	55	55	59	55	49	60	65	28
Not enough full-time professionals	50	53	54	45	46	55	46	52	47	53	48	45	59	22
Don't feel right unless doing something constructive	46	47	51	46	36	53	50	35	42	50	38	44	62	10
Volunteers have personal qualifications not found in professionals	40	47	42	37	31	55	39	26	40	40	35	39	49	16
Have special skills	39	57	34	32	28	38	35	48	45	33	32	40	47	17
Good way to become part of community	38	40	36	40	36	50	39	27	35	42	38	34	46	11
My duty as a citizen	36	35	37	36	36	45	32	35	37	34	31	36	42	12
Life has been good to me and feel guilty if don't help	26	28	26	26	22	34	29	15	26	26	14	31	36	11
Feel a sense of importance	21	22	23	17	21	23	23	13	22	18	16	21	25	6
Keep up with my field of work	21	23	24	19	19	21	19	28	24	19	26	19	20	6
Want to keep busy	15	21	14	14	10	24	16	6	14	17	10	14	25	2
Want to do something different	11	15	11	8	7	17	10	6	11	10	11	10	11	1
Chance to learn new skill	10	7	14	10	9	12	12	6	8	13	16	7	7	1
Restless sitting at home	6	5	6	6	6	11	5	2	2	9	2	5	11	1

[1] *These percentages represent the proportion who felt the listed reason was "very important" in their decision to become a volunteer.*
[2] *These percentages represent responses to the question, "Which two or three reasons on this list do you feel are most important?"*

among the volunteers. It is so firm that frustrating experiences are unlikely to disturb it.

This sense of altruism and social awareness emerged when each individual was asked why he had become a volunteer.

Four reasons are felt to be very important by more than half of the respondents:

I find the work very interesting (79 percent).

I feel a real need to help other people (72 percent).

I like being with other people (61 percent).

My volunteer work will help to make this a better community (57 percent).

Interesting work is naturally a prerequisite to volunteering. An individual is unlikely to freely offer his services if he finds the work dull.

Also emphasized are the twin goals of service to other individuals *and* service to the community, both set in the context of finding enjoyment in being with others.

As the last column of Table 8 indicates, "feeling a real need to help other people" is considered far and away the single *most* important reason for becoming a volunteer.

It is significant how unselfish the volunteers appear in their responses. "Being restless at home," "wanting to keep busy" or "do something different," "a chance to learn new skills," "feeling a sense of importance," and "keeping up with my field of work" —all of which are personal-benefit reasons for volunteering—are all considered relatively unimportant by the volunteers.

Some sense of obligation is expressed by between one-quarter and one-half of the volunteers. This is seen in reasons such as "don't feel right unless doing something constructive," service is "my duty as a citizen," and "life has been good to me and I feel guilty if I don't try to help other people."

More directly related to the work they are doing, 50 percent feel a very important reason for volunteering is that "there are not enough full-time professionals to do all the work." Forty percent feel volunteers have personal qualifications to offer which are not found in paid employees, and 39 percent feel that they have special skills to offer. These last two items are most often cited by volunteers in adult institutions.

There is a general tendency for the importance attributed to each reason to rise with increasing age and to fall with increasing education. However, volunteers who have done postgraduate work cite "special skills" and "keeping up with my field of work" somewhat more often than do those with less education.

Observation: In order of decreasing importance, there are three groups of reasons why an individual might become a volunteer:

A desire to help others.

A recognition of the need for volunteers and a sense of obligation.

Anticipated personal benefits.

One could argue that these are spurious distinctions, that in psychological terms each set of reasons is simply a different way of describing a method of satisfying inner needs. Perhaps this is true, but, at least in operational terms, it is irrelevant.

Whatever the basic motivations, an individual who thinks in terms of a desire to help others is likely to have an effectiveness and ability to relate to the offender far greater than the individual who thinks in terms of his own personal benefit.

One other point should be made here, in view of the emphasis correctional personnel put on increasing public participation. It is encouraging to see that the volunteers recognize the community's responsibility in this area and feel that volunteerism is a way to improve the entire community.

9. Do volunteers have something special to offer in corrections, or are they useful mainly because there are too few paid staff?

	Something special	Not enough paid staff
	%	%
Total	83	17
Volunteers working in:		
Adult institutions	90	10
Juvenile institutions	87	13
Field agencies	80	20
Volunteer courts	68	32
Education of volunteers:		
High school or less	83	17
College	85	15
Postgraduate	78	22
Age of volunteers:		
Under 35	77	23
35 to 49	85	15
50 and over	88	12

10. What "something special" do volunteers have to offer?

(Base: Individuals who believe volunteers have "something special" to offer)

	Total
	%
No barrier of authority—offender can confide in us	28
Personal interest and involvement	23
Unprofessional, fresh not hardened	18
Dedication—not working for money	15
Contact with outside world	15
Can be a friend, show real concern	13
Can give more time than staff	13
Give individual attention	11
Have different skills to offer	8
Unbiased, objective	7
Personal experience allows us to understand better	6
Other	27

The volunteers also believe they bring a unique quality to the correctional process. They believe that they "have something special to offer clients that the professional staff cannot offer." Very few feel that "volunteers are needed mainly because there are not enough professional staff."

More than eight in ten feel that volunteers have something special to offer. These eight in ten were then asked what the "something special" is.

Observation: In the above responses, the volunteers show an awareness of the potentially valuable role they can play in the correctional process.

Parenthetically, we might add that such responses can be the core of an effective recruiting message to attract new volunteers to corrections.

Attitudes toward Crime

For the volunteers, the acceptance of the community's responsibility to help the offender is based on their belief that the community must bear a large measure of responsibility for the individual turning to crime in the first place. Each individual was asked:

> "If you had to choose, would you say that an individual's own personality problems or the outside social conditions an individual is raised in are the major cause of most people becoming criminals or delinquents?"

11. Major reasons why people become criminals or delinquents.

	Personality problems	Social conditions	Both equally
	%	%	%
All volunteers	24	42	34
Volunteers working in:			
Adult institutions	32	33	35
Juvenile institutions	17	48	35
Field agencies	25	45	30
Volunteer courts	25	43	32
Education:			
High school	34	30	36
College	20	45	35
Postgraduate	20	52	28
Sex:			
Men	30	42	28
Women	20	42	38
Age:			
Under 35	16	54	30
35 to 49	34	36	30
50 and over	22	34	44
Correctional personnel [1]	34	31	35

[1] Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, *p. 17.*

Over four in ten (42 percent) feel that outside social conditions are the primary cause, and an additional 34 percent feel they are as important as personality problems. The younger a volunteer is and the more education he has, the more likely he is to feel outside social conditions are the primary cause an individual becomes a criminal. Only volunteers in adult institutions are prepared to give as much weight to personality problems as to outside social conditions.

Observation: It is particularly interesting to compare these results with those developed in the survey of correctional personnel. The volunteers lean more toward outside social conditions as a primary cause of crime than do the professional correctional workers. One could almost say from these results that the volunteer is somewhat better suited to serve as an advocate for the offender in the community than the professional, for he appears more willing to lay the responsibility for the offender's behavior on society's doorstep.

Each volunteer was also asked to indicate, in his own words, what he felt were the specific major reasons why people become criminals or delinquents. Table 12 presents the responses given by the volunteers, in comparison with responses to the same question given by the general public and by correctional personnel in previous studies.

12. Specific reasons why people become criminals or delinquents. [1]

Causes	Volunteers	Adult public [2]	Correctional personnel [3]
	%	%	%
Broken homes	44	9	23
Environments	42	16	45
Parents too lax	34	59	44
Poverty	27	16	35
Lack of love and understanding	24	–	–
Mentally ill	24	3	29
Lack of education	17	12	25
Lack of moral guidance	16	–	–
Lack of self-respect and dignity	15	–	–
Poor communications between parent and child	10	–	–
Alcohol	10	10	9
Time of unrest	10	4	9
Lack of religion	8	7	3
Not enough recreation for young	8	9	4
Frustration	8	–	–
Young people have no morals	6	12	11
For kicks	6	9	10
Drugs, narcotics	4	10	4
Unemployment	3	12	6
Kids see violence on TV	3	4	–
Cars and houses unlocked	3	–	–
Courts too lenient	2	5	–
Some parents too strict	2	–	–

[1] *Percentages add to more than 100 because some respondents gave more than one answer.*
[2] The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections, *p. 5.*
[3] Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, *p. 16.*

The volunteers are clearly more similar to the correctional personnel in their attitudes toward crime than they are to the general public, giving considerably more weight to environmental factors

than to parental laxness. (It is interesting to note that volunteers place more weight on "broken homes" than the correctional personnel do. The general public felt this factor was of minor importance.)

The volunteers also introduced a new dimension—the failure of interpersonal communications and relationships—which was not directly mentioned by either correctional personnel or the general public. This dimension is seen in "lack of love and understanding," "lack of self-respect and dignity," and "poor communications between parent and child."

Observation: In response to these questions, the volunteers clearly align themselves with the direction of modern correctional thinking.

As members of the outside community (and often an elite within that society), the volunteers are well placed to carry this correctional message to the public.

Hesitations about Working in Corrections

One of the objections correctional personnel make to the use of volunteers is that they sometimes show an insensitivity to the delicate problems of dealing with the offender.

There is some suggestion in the attitudes of the volunteers that the objection is not without foundation. Each individual was asked if there were any particular concerns or fears he had about doing correctional volunteer work. Almost two-thirds of the volunteers (65 percent) said they had no concerns or fears when they entered volunteer work in corrections.

	Percent of all volunteers
Had concerns or fears	35
Volunteers in:	
Adult institutions	28
Juvenile institutions	37
Field agencies	38
Volunteer courts	41
Education:	
High school or less	28
College	40
Postgraduate	35
Age:	
Under 35	41
35 to 49	37
50 and over	23

Concern was expressed most frequently by those in volunteer courts, by those with more than a high school education, and by the under-35 age group.

Those who had fears or concerns listed them as follows, some specifying several.

	Percent of volunteers with fears
Fear of inadequacy or failure	43
Inability to communicate with offenders	18
Lack of experience	15
Not being accepted	14
Becoming too involved	11
Fear for personal safety	11

Forty-three percent of those who had concerns expressed a fear of being inadequate, of failing. This represents 15 percent of all those interviewed. An additional 18 percent (6 percent of the total) were concerned about a possible "inability to communicate with the offender."

Observation: The volunteers appear to be a confident group. Only one in three had concerns or fears about going into correctional work, and, while most of these concerns involved possible failure, this still leaves a large majority who expressed no initial concern.

In some ways this is unfortunate. It suggests not just confidence, but overconfidence. Less than one in five had had any previous correctional experience. To enter such a setting, where relations with others are so delicately and tensely balanced, without having any concerns seems strange.

It is as though the volunteers believed that the strength of their warmth and desire to help would be sufficient to accomplish their goals. In many cases, this may be all that is needed, but such an approach can also evoke unrealizable expectations, cynicism, and a whole gamut of disruptive attitudes if applied uncritically. The freshness of approach that volunteers have to offer is certainly not an unmixed blessing.

CHAPTER V

VOLUNTEER WORK IN CORRECTIONAL AGENCIES

Previous Knowledge of Corrections

HALF OF the volunteers indicated they had "hardly any knowledge" about corrections before beginning volunteer work in this field.

13. Volunteers' previous knowledge of corrections.

	Great deal	Some	Hardly any
	%	%	%
Total	14	36	50
Volunteers working in:			
Adult institutions	18	25	57
Juvenile institutions	10	36	54
Field agencies	13	39	48
Volunteer courts	16	53	31
Education:			
High school or less	9	24	67
College	12	39	49
Postgraduate	22	43	35
Sex:			
Men	18	36	46
Women	9	36	55

Only among those who have had some graduate work do as many as one in five feel they had a great deal of previous knowledge about corrections.

Among the 50 percent who said they had a great deal or some prior knowledge about corrections, experience and academic training were most often mentioned as the sources of this knowledge. Reading and friends or relatives were listed by smaller but substantial proportions of the volunteers.

Observation: Unfortunately we did not probe for what was meant by "experience" or "academic training." However, these sources were unlikely to be directly related to corrections.

"Experience" probably implies, in most cases, "experience of the world," while "academic training" suggests courses in education, psychology, and sociology.

Initial Contact with the Agency

Volunteers' first sources of information about their current correctional agency were quite varied. The largest single source was a church or some other organization. Only one out of five volunteers learned about the agency through contact with its staff.

14. How volunteers first heard about the agency where they are working.

Source of information	Total	Volunteers working in – Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts
	%	%	%	%	%
Church or other organization membership	26	26	39	23	9
Contact with agency staff	19	24	11	20	24
Friend or relative	18	19	17	19	15
Contact with other volunteers	17	22	13	15	15
Club	9	5	8	12	7
Through TV, radio, newspapers	7	3	8	9	7
Class or course of study	4	2	7	4	6
Place of employment	4	4	1	3	7
Community volunteer bureau	2	1	2	3	–
Other	18	17	13	18	28

Seven in ten volunteered as individuals rather than as part of a group. Juvenile institutions were the only setting in which about the same number of persons volunteered as a group and as individuals.

15. Who made the first contact with regard to volunteer work?

	Agency	Individual volunteer or group	Not sure
	%	%	%
Total	31	64	5
Volunteers working in:			
Adult institutions	35	60	5
Juvenile institutions	25	70	5
Field agencies	34	61	5
Volunteer courts	31	66	3
Education:			
High school	24	71	5
College	32	63	5
Postgraduate	36	61	3
Sex:			
Men	35	61	4
Women	27	67	6
Age:			
Under 35	24	73	3
35-49	34	60	6
50 and over	36	58	6

Men were more likely than women to volunteer as individuals.

Overall, only 31 percent of the volunteers said the agency made the first contact. While there are some variations by setting, education, age, and sex, the agency initiated the contact with no more than 36 percent of any group.

The initial screening appears to have been somewhat casual in all settings.

16. Some elements of initial screening.

	Total	Volunteers working in—			
		Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts
	%	%	%	%	%
Not interviewed by anyone special but given job wanted	45	50	48	42	37
Interviewed by someone at agency	41	29	41	46	55
Asked to give written information	25	15	19	34	37
Interviewed by staff at a community volunteer bureau	19	9	18	25	22
Asked to give references	18	13	12	24	27

Only 41 percent of the volunteers were interviewed by someone at the agency. Only 25 percent were asked to give written information about themselves, and only 18 percent were asked to give references.

Observation: At least in the initial phases, corrections appears to be the passive partner in its relation with the volunteers.

- Volunteers have little prior knowledge of correctional practices.
- The volunteers receive their information about the agency mainly from other sources than the agency itself.
- The volunteer usually initiates the contact with the agency.
- The screening procedure does not appear to be very selective.

As long as corrections exhibits this passivity, it is unlikely that volunteer programs will increase in number, in size, or in quality.

Current Involvement with Agency

In Chapter IV both the length of all volunteer service and that of volunteer work in corrections were presented. Table 17 shows the length of time the volunteers have been in the current correctional agency.

Adult institutions apparently have the most stable programs, with a median length of service of 1.9 years; three in ten volunteers in these institutions had been with the agency five years or more. Field agencies have a median length of service of 1.7 years; juvenile institutions and volunteer courts, 1.3 years.

17. Length of service in current correctional agency.

Length of service	Total	Volunteers working in—			
		Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts
	%	%	%	%	%
Under 6 months	15	11	21	13	15
6 months to 1 year	21	20	21	21	24
1 to 2 years	24	22	24	23	35
3 to 4 years	19	17	18	23	10
5 to 6 years	11	17	8	9	10
7 to 10 years	6	9	4	6	3
More than 10 years	4	4	4	5	3
Median years	1.6	1.9	1.3	1.7	1.3

Each volunteer was asked how often he came to the agency and how long he stayed on each visit.

18. Frequency and duration of volunteers' visits.

	Total	Volunteers working in—			
		Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts
Frequency of visits	%	%	%	%	%
Daily	4	4	5	3	6
Four times a week	14	14	13	14	17
Once a week	35	31	48	32	17
Once in two weeks	15	16	11	17	17
Once a month	19	20	15	19	24
Less often	13	15	8	15	19
Duration of visits					
Under 1 hour	7	1	9	8	11
1 hour	16	12	20	11	26
2 hours	36	46	37	32	26
3 hours	20	21	16	24	18
More than 3 hours	21	20	18	25	19
Median hours	2.7	2.8	2.6	3.0	2.6

A majority (53 percent) of volunteers come to the agency at least once a week. Visits are most frequent in juvenile institutions (66 percent at least once a week) and least frequent in volunteer courts (40 percent at least once a week).

The median length of visits is approximately 2.7 hours, with little variation from setting to setting. However, there are some differences, particularly at the lower end of the scale. In adult institutions, only 13 percent of the volunteers stay for one hour or less, as compared with 19 percent in field settings and 29 percent in juvenile institutions.

Observation: The data do not show how the frequency and duration of visits by correctional volunteers compare with volunteer work in other areas. But comparison can be made between the different correctional settings. A crude ranking on the intensity of participation can be developed

using these three measures: length of time in agency, frequency of visits, duration of visits.

Length of time in agencies		*Frequency of visits*	
Longest	1. Adult institutions	Most often	1. Juvenile institutions
	2. Field		2. Field
	3. Volunteer courts		3. Adult institutions
	4. Juvenile institutions		4. Volunteer courts
Shortest		Least often	

Duration of visits

Longest
1. Field
2. Adult institutions
3. Juvenile institutions
4. Volunteer courts

Shortest

Adding the position numbers for each setting will produce a score. The lower the score, the higher the intensity of participation.

Agency	*Score*
Field	5
Adult institutions	6
Juvenile institutions	8
Volunteer courts	11

As a rough indication, this procedure points to field agencies and adult institutions as having the highest intensity of participation, volunteer courts the lowest, with juvenile institutions somewhere in between.

Requirements for Work in Agency

Each volunteer was asked:
"Were there any education, experience or other requirements you had to satisfy before you were accepted into this agency?"

Overall, only 15 percent of the volunteers indicated that they had to satisfy requirements before being accepted by the agency for volunteer work.

	Percent of all volunteers
All volunteers reporting requirements	15
Volunteers working in:	
Adult institutions	17
Juvenile institutions	13
Field agencies	14
Volunteer courts	19
Education of volunteers:	
High school or less	7
College	15
Postgraduate	26

When the 15 percent were asked what the requirements were, the answers were somewhat vague. About half indicated some type of educational requirement, and half some experience requirement, usually experience in similar work.

Observation: There does not appear to be any clearly defined set of requirements for correctional volunteer work, but one must be wary of assuming that there are no requirements at all. As a whole, the volunteers are a well-educated group and may meet certain basic standards without even being aware that they are being tested on these standards.

Also, as will be seen shortly, those with more education tend to be working in the more professionally oriented jobs. The more education an individual has, the more likely he is to say that there were prior requirements. Obviously there is a relationship between a specific job and the prior training or experience required to perform that job.

Initial Orientation and Training

One out of two volunteers said that he had received some initial orientation and training when he began work in the agency.

	Percent of all volunteers
All volunteers receiving orientation, training	49
Volunteers working in:	
Adult institutions	34
Juvenile institutions	44
Field agencies	61
Volunteer courts	58
Education of volunteers:	
High school or less	46
College	47
Postgraduate	54

Both institutional settings (particularly adult institutions) trail far behind field settings and volunteer courts in the number of volunteers who received initial orientation and training.

Volunteers who had received orientation and training were asked to describe its elements. Most often mentioned was help from the staff.

19. Elements of initial orientation and training.

(Base: Volunteers who received initial orientation and training)

	Total	Volunteers working in— Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts
	%	%	%	%	%
Help from staff	83	76	82	84	90
Interview with supervisor or other agency personnel	77	73	79	78	79
Orientation session provided by agency	75	75	77	76	69
Written directions and instructions	52	41	43	62	56
Instructions from another volunteer	39	22	48	40	46
Training provided by other agency	18	12	15	22	21
Other	12	16	20	7	5

Among those who did receive orientation, the procedure appears to have been quite thorough. Three-fourths of those given orientation had an interview with their supervisor or other agency personnel, and three-fourths attended an orientation session. Half were given written instructions. In addition, over eight in ten (83 percent) said that their initial training and orientation gave them an accurate picture of what they would be doing in the agency.

Observation: In agencies which have orientation programs, these programs appear to be successful in preparing the volunteer for his work in the agency.

But only half of the volunteers are part of such programs. This is another sign of the correctional field's passiveness in its relationship with the volunteer.

Current Jobs

Almost nine in ten of the volunteers work directly with the offender.

	Percent of volunteers
All volunteers working directly with offender	87
Volunteers working in:	
Adult institutions	87
Juvenile institutions	89
Field agencies	85
Volunteer courts	86

Each volunteer was next asked to indicate the kinds of work he was doing in the agency.

20. Volunteers' current work.[1]

Institutions	Total	Volunteers working in— Adult institutions	Volunteers working in— Juvenile institutions	Education: High school	Education: College	Education: Post graduate	Sex: Men	Sex: Women	Age: Under 35	Age: 35 to 49	Age: 50 and over
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Self-improvement programs	30	32	28	27	32	31	28	32	30	33	24
Counseling, guidance or testing	27	34	19	26	27	31	33	18	19	32	32
Recreational activities	26	13	41	26	31	18	17	39	32	26	18
Sponsorship—visitation	25	24	27	23	27	25	24	27	31	25	19
Entertainment activities	23	11	36	30	24	13	15	36	27	23	18
Religious programs	22	26	19	18	22	27	24	19	21	21	27
Prerelease preparation	17	21	13	18	16	19	20	12	16	21	12
Arts and crafts programs	15	5	25	19	16	7	6	27	11	17	15
Teaching	13	14	13	8	13	21	13	14	12	14	15
Field Settings	**Total**	**Field**	**Volunteer courts**								
Counseling, guidance or testing	51	52	50	38	48	72	66	40	48	58	43
Probation/parole sponsorship	30	32	24	18	32	33	33	27	26	37	23
Recreational activities	27	30	20	25	30	23	13	38	34	23	25
Volunteer probation/parole officer	26	21	37	22	23	33	27	25	30	32	7
Entertainment activities	22	26	12	18	25	18	8	32	29	17	20
Self-improvement programs	20	20	21	12	27	18	12	26	24	19	18
Job placement	20	21	15	18	19	23	29	12	15	26	16
Teaching	13	15	9	10	14	16	8	18	17	11	13
Juvenile shelter programs	10	11	8	10	9	9	10	10	4	16	9
Religious programs	6	8	2	3	7	7	6	6	1	10	7

[1] *Totals add to more than 100% because some volunteers indicated more than one kind of work.*

In institutional settings volunteers participate in a wide range of activities, with at least 25 percent engaged in self-improvement programs, guidance, counseling or testing, recreational activities, and sponsorship-visitation.

Counseling by volunteers appears significantly more often in adult institutions than in juvenile institutions. Conversely the emphasis on recreational, entertainment, and arts and crafts activities is far heavier in juvenile institutions than in adult institutions.

In field settings over half of the volunteers are involved in counseling, guidance or testing, about three in ten in probation-parole sponsorship, and just over one in four in both recreational activities and volunteer probation-parole work.

In both institutional and field settings men are more involved with counseling and less involved with entertainment or recreational activities than are women.

It is interesting that, in institutions, the youngest volunteers are the age group least involved with counseling, but in field settings they tend to do more counseling. Also in the field the younger volunteers are more likely to be serving as volunteer probation or parole officers.

Education is another factor relevant to the work volunteers do. In institutions, the more education an individual has, the more likely he is to be teaching or involved with religious programs. He is less likely to be involved with recreation, entertain-

ment and arts and crafts activities. In field settings the sharpest educational difference is found in the area of guidance, counseling, and testing. Over seven in ten of those who have postgraduate education work in this area, as compared with less than four in ten with no more than a high school education. More education also leads to a higher involvement in probation or parole sponsorship programs.

Observation: Volunteer work covers a wide range of possible activities in correctional agencies.

In field settings, there is a heavy emphasis on volunteer counseling, and it is encouraging that there is a tendency for those who have done graduate work to be more involved in this delicate area. The distribution of graduate degrees previously noted suggests that through their formal education these individuals may have developed some expertise which can help them in this area.

Nearly three-fourths (72 percent) of the volunteers indicated that they had had an opportunity to choose the kind of work they would do. Volunteers in institutions are more likely to have had a choice than those in field settings and the volunteer courts. Among the 28 percent who had been assigned to a job, rather than choosing it for themselves, nine out of ten felt that the work was well selected for them.

Volunteers generally feel that their job is clearly defined. Less than one in five (17 percent) said that they often do not know what they are supposed to be doing. In the field agencies, the proportion was as high as 23 percent.

Observation: The 17 percent whose job is not clearly defined is a small proportion of the total. However, it does represent a waste of willing and dedicated manpower.

Training for Current Jobs

While the work done by volunteers covers a wide range of activities, only one in five (22 percent) indicated that he had received any specific training for his current job.

Of those who did receive some training, 41 percent said it included classroom work, 48 percent named on-the-job training, and 34 percent some other type of preparation. Some, of course, mentioned more than one training method. Furthermore, 70 percent said they found their training very helpful.

Table 21 shows the proportion of volunteers who have received training according to the specific job they are performing in the agency.

Observation: For the most part, the direction is right. Those in more sensitive areas are more likely to have received some training. But though the direction is right, the dimensions are not. For only 35 percent of the volunteer probation or parole officers and only 31 percent of those in counseling, guidance, and testing to have received training is just too few. As a group they are unlikely to be able to assume real responsibilities with so little training.

21. Training received, by job performed.

	Volunteers in institutions	
	Received training	Did not receive training
	%	%
Total	20	80
Religious programs	29	71
Counseling, guidance, testing	28	72
Prerelease preparation	26	74
Teaching	22	78
Self-improvement programs	20	80
Sponsorship-visitation programs	18	82
Arts and crafts programs	15	85
Recreational activities	13	87
Entertainment activities	13	87
	Volunteers in field agencies and volunteer courts	
	Received training	Did not receive training
	%	%
Total	23	77
Volunteer probation/parole officer	35	65
Counseling, guidance, testing	31	69
Probation/parole sponsorship	28	72
Job placement	25	75
Self-improvement programs	24	76
Juvenile shelter programs	21	79
Teaching	18	82
Entertainment activities	17	83
Recreational activities	15	85
Religious programs	13	87

The next finding is very disturbing. Each volunteer who had not received any training for his current job was asked:

"Do you think some type of training would have been helpful in preparing you for the job you are now doing in this agency, or don't you think it is really necessary for your job?"

22. Need for training on current job felt by volunteers who received none.

(Base: Volunteers who did not receive training for job)

	Would be helpful	Not necessary
	%	%
Total	36	64
Volunteers working in:		
Adult institutions	31	69
Juvenile institutions	35	65
Field agencies	38	62
Volunteer courts	52	48

Among the 78 percent of the volunteers who received no training, two out of three feel any training would be unnecessary. Only in volunteer courts do a slim majority feel training would be helpful.

Observation: If we add the 22 percent of the total who received training and the 28 percent of the total (36 percent of 78 percent) who would like some training but have not received any, we are left with 50 percent of the volunteers who neither received training nor feel it is necessary for their current job.

An explanation for the attitude of this group must lie in two areas. On the one hand, it is partly a mark of the overconfidence mentioned previously, an attitude of "we can handle it without any of your training." On the other hand, some volunteers are being placed in the kinds of jobs where training is just not necessary.

It should also be noted that almost three in ten (28 percent) of all the volunteers feel some training would be helpful but are not receiving it.

In a sense, one can say that the correctional agencies are responsible both for putting people in jobs which don't require training and for not providing training to those who want it and that the agencies should take steps to correct such a situation.

The answer is not always so simple. Providing meaningful work and training can be difficut, particularly when a volunteer is seen only once a week for a few hours. Because the individual is not an employee, he may decide not to show up again or to skip visits or not to apply himself. The agency in such a case cannot make meaningful demands or impose sanctions on the volunteer.

Of course, this is a two-way street. If the agency approaches the volunteer with this attitude, the volunteer may well exhibit the behavior expected of him.

For real success, both the agency and the volunteer must be willing to make a solid commitment to each other.

If we had to choose, on the basis of the data in this study and the previous study on correctional personnel, we would say that it is certainly the correctional agencies which have been most reluctant to make this commitment.

Supervision and Evaluation

For most volunteers the chain of command is clear. Over eight in ten (84 percent) indicated there is one person in particular they refer to when they need help or advice.

Volunteers were asked to describe the status of their supervisors. Only one out of six are paid staff members whose entire responsibility is to coordinate the work of volunteers. In volunteer courts, one out of four supervisors are paid staff who work entirely with volunteers.

Observation: It appears that there are very few volunteer correctional programs which are of sufficient size (or sufficient importance) to warrant a full-time staff supervisor.

23. Who is the supervisor?

	Total	Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts
	%	%	%	%	%
Paid staff member with duties other than volunteer coordinator	61	63	61	65	37
Paid staff member assigned to volunteer coordination only	16	18	17	10	25
Unpaid volunteer	12	10	13	10	22
Paid volunteer [1]	1	1	1	1	2
Other	3	5	1	3	5
Not sure	7	3	7	11	9

[1] *A volunteer who receives a token amount as reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses.*

At least partly because supervisors have other responsibilities, only one in four of the volunteers said they have ever been formally evaluated by a staff member in the agency.

	Percent of all volunteers
Volunteers who have been evaluated	26
Volunteers working in:	
Adult institutions	25
Juvenile institutions	29
Field agencies	23
Volunteer courts	28

Observation: Only half of the volunteers received any initial orientation and training.

Only one in five received any training for his current job.

Only one in four has ever been formally evaluated by a staff member.

Only one in six has as a supervisor a staff member whose sole responsibility is to coordinate the work of volunteers.

This conclusion seems clear: Most correctional agencies have not made a real commitment to their volunteer programs.

CHAPTER VI

VOLUNTEERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD WORK IN CORRECTIONS

IN THE PRECEDING chapter, after examining a number of objective factors (e.g., how the initial contact was made, extent of orientation and training, supervision, etc.), we concluded that there are a number of shortcomings in the way many volunteer programs are handled. In this chapter, we look at the opinions of the volunteers about these programs and find that these shortcomings hardly appear at all. The volunteers overwhelmingly approve of their program, their supervisors, the staff, the appreciation they receive, and almost every other aspect of their work.

How are we to account for this seeming discrepancy? There are, we believe, two explanations.

1. A volunteer is someone who freely gives his service. If he felt the agency in which he was working was badly organized, his supervisor harsh and demanding, the staff disinterested and unhelpful, his work unappreciated, he would leave. He is not obliged to be there, and he wouldn't be if the surroundings were unpleasant.

Consequently, in looking at volunteers, we are looking at individuals who, almost inevitably, are going to view their surroundings favorably. If they didn't, they would be volunteering somewhere else.

But this is not to say that conditions really are good. There is adequate reason to believe that volunteers are not particularly qualified to judge the effectiveness of their own involvement. Somewhat overconfident, the volunteers are unlikely to believe their contributions and involvement are not all they could be and thus cannot really view the situation objectively. Also, their participation is clearly limited in frequency and duration of contact with the agency, and it must be extremely difficult for them to have an accurate picture of what is going on, including the significance of their own involvement with the agency.

2. The second explanation is that there really is no discrepancy. In the previous survey of correctional personnel, those in agencies which used volunteers felt positively toward them and were willing to see their use increased. It is not unlikely, then, that the relations between staff and volunteers in these agencies are good, perhaps in some cases even as good as the volunteers seem to feel they are.

But it is still possible, on the basis of the objective criteria we have examined and in spite of the favorable attitudes expressed by volunteers as well as correctional personnel, to conclude that the effectiveness of volunteer programs could be improved.

Before examining the volunteers' attitudes toward their own role, it may be helpful to look at their feelings about the agency's goals and successes. Particularly in this area, their appraisal appears quite realistic.

Agency Goals and Successes

Each volunteer was asked which of four basic correctional goals he felt was most emphasized in the setting in which he was working and which was next. The four goals were:

Punishing the individual convicted of a crime.

Rehabilitating the individual so that he might become a productive citizen.

Protecting society from crimes he might be committing.

Changing community attitudes which contribute to crime and delinquency.

24. Primary goal of correctional agencies as perceived by volunteers working in them.

Goal	Total	Volunteers working in—				Education of volunteers		
		Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts	High school	College	Post graduate
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Punishment	13	14	13	13	8	10	12	18
Rehabilitation ..	74	69	77	76	75	80	75	66
Protection of society	9	13	7	9	6	7	9	13
Changing community....	4	4	3	2	11	3	4	3

In each setting, rehabilitation is considered the primary emphasis by at least seven in ten. As education increases, so does the feeling that punishment or protection is the primary goal.

In the next table the primary goal and the next most important goal are combined as a measure of overall agency emphasis.

25. Primary plus secondary goals of correctional agencies, as perceived by volunteers working in them. [1]

Goals	Total	Volunteers working in—				Education of volunteers		
		Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts	High school	College	Post graduate
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Punishment	28	33	28	25	21	21	27	38
Rehabilitation ..	87	86	90	86	87	94	87	79
Protection of society	37	37	38	37	36	30	35	51
Changing community....	43	39	38	46	50	49	45	29

[1] *Percentages represent the proportion who felt the particular goal was most emphasized or second most emphasized in a particular setting.*

Rehabilitation is, of course, most often mentioned as receiving either the primary or secondary emphasis. Changing community attitudes is, surprisingly, in second place. This emphasis is particularly strong in field and volunteer court settings. It tends to decline as education increases.

It is interesting to compare these results with those obtained from correctional personnel in our previous study.

In all settings, volunteers believe more strongly than the personnel that punishment is a primary or secondary goal and feel to a lesser extent than the personnel that protection of society is a primary or secondary goal. In adult institutions and field settings more volunteers than personnel believe changing community attitudes is a primary or secondary goal.

Observation: We have no certain reason for this difference between the volunteers and correctional personnel.

However, the volunteers seem to be somewhat skeptical about the agencies. Relative to the personnel, the volunteers emphasize the more negative aspect of corrections (punishment and protection of society) which is the prime responsibility of the professionals, while emphasizing that goal which they feel they themselves can do something about—that is, changing community attitudes.

The volunteers were next asked what they felt the primary and secondary goals of the agency *should be*. First, let us look at the primary goal.

To both the volunteers and the professionals, rehabilitation is the primary goal. However, the volunteers place more weight on this goal and less on protection than do the professionals.

When the primary and secondary goals are combined, changing community attitudes emerges easily in second place behind rehabilitation. It is particularly interesting that the volunteers look more to changing community attitudes as a secondary goal than do the correctional personnel.

26. Primary plus secondary goals of correctional agencies, as perceived by volunteers and by correctional personnel. [1]

Goals	Adult institutions		Juvenile institutions		Field agencies	
	Volunteers	Personnel [2]	Volunteers	Personnel [2]	Volunteers	Personnel [2]
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Punishment	33	23	28	14	25	9
Rehabilitation	86	84	90	92	86	95
Protection of society.....	37	66	38	49	37	65
Changing community	39	24	38	40	46	28

[1] *For each setting only the responses of volunteers or personnel working in that setting have been included.*
[2] Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, *p. 15.*

27. What the primary goal of the correctional agency should be, as perceived by volunteers and by correctional personnel.

Goal	Correctional personnel [1]	Total	Volunteers working in—				Education of volunteers		
			Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts	High school	College	Post graduate
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Punishment	2	2	1	1	2	6	4	2	1
Rehabilitation	69	83	82	83	87	74	83	83	84
Protection of society.....	16	3	3	1	4	2	2	2	4
Changing community	13	12	14	15	7	18	11	13	11

[1] Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, *p. 15.*

28. *What the goals of correctional agencies (primary plus secondary) should be, as perceived by volunteers and by correctional personnel.*[1]

Goals	Correctional personnel [2]	Total	Volunteers working in—				Education of volunteers		
			Adult institutions	Juvenile institutions	Field agencies	Volunteer courts	High school	College	Post graduate
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Punishment	5	9	9	6	10	11	14	9	5
Rehabilitation	95	98	98	99	97	98	97	98	99
Protection of society	45	21	24	20	26	17	19	18	27
Changing community	53	67	65	72	66	68	53	71	65

[1] *Percentages represent proportion who felt the particular goal should have primary or secondary emphasis in the correctional agency.*
[2] Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, *p. 16.*

Observation: **The volunteers believe society must bear a major share of responsibility for the existence of crime and that society must make a major effort to help alleviate the conditions which lead to crime.**

In the above responses, the volunteers are saying that correctional agencies must play a leading role in moving society to make this effort.

The volunteers appear more ready to move the agencies into this leadership role than does the correctional establishment itself.

Perhaps because of the disparity between current goals and what the volunteers feel the goals should be, only one in three said their agency helps "most of the offenders it deals with."

29. *How many offenders are helped by agency?*

	Most	Some	Only a few	Not sure
	%	%	%	%
Total	33	43	13	11
Volunteers working in:				
Adult institutions	35	42	18	5
Juvenile institutions	23	46	19	12
Field agencies	40	40	6	14
Volunteer courts	29	51	9	11
Education:				
High school	36	41	8	15
College	32	43	16	9
Postgraduate	29	49	15	7
Sex:				
Men	38	42	13	7
Women	27	45	13	15
Age:				
Under 35	26	47	15	12
35 to 49	33	45	13	9
50 and over	40	38	12	10

Only in field agencies do as many as four in ten of the volunteers feel most offenders are helped. This proportion drops to less than one in four among volunteers in juvenile institutions.

The more education an individual has or the younger he is, the more likely he is to be skeptical about the number of offenders who are actually helped by the agency.

Rating of the Volunteer Program

Eight in ten of the respondents give the volunteer program in their agency a positive rating ("excellent" or "pretty good").

30. *How good is the volunteer program?*

	Excellent	Pretty good	Only fair	Poor	(Not sure)
	%	%	%	%	%
Total	40	42	13	5	(9)
Volunteers working in:					
Adult institutions	44	39	12	5	(11)
Juvenile institutions	31	52	10	7	(12)
Field agencies	43	39	14	4	(6)
Volunteer courts	46	39	15	–	(5)
Education:					
High school	49	38	9	4	(8)
College	41	45	11	3	(9)
Postgraduate	28	46	22	4	(10)
Correctional personnel	35	41	20	4	(11)

Only in juvenile institutions do less than four in ten give their program a rating of excellence. Paralleling the findings for the correctional personnel, the rating declines as education increases.

The lower "excellent" rating for the programs in juvenile institutions is partly explained in the next table. In the juvenile institutions the programs are felt to be somewhat less well organized than in other agencies.

31. *How well organized is the volunteer program?*

	Very well	Fairly well	Poorly	Not sure
	%	%	%	%
Total	44	36	11	9
Volunteers working in:				
Adult institutions	47	30	11	12
Juvenile institutions	35	38	18	9
Field agencies	47	38	8	7
Volunteer courts	48	41	3	8
Education:				
High school	52	34	10	4
College	46	34	11	9
Postgraduate	29	45	13	13

There is a certain amount of subdued criticism on the question of program organization. One in ten feel the program is poorly organized. One in ten are unsure, an unlikely response if the program were really well organized. Finally an additional one in three say the program is fairly well organized.

Observation: With over half of the volunteers expressing opinions which imply that the organization of their program is not all that it could be, there is clearly room for improvement in this area.

Perhaps if more programs were supervised by staff members whose sole responsibility was the volunteer program, there would be fewer organizational difficulties. In many cases, of course, the present set-up is necessitated by budgetary and personnel limitations.

Relations with Supervisor and Staff

Even though there is some question about organization, the volunteers give their supervisors a strong positive rating.

32. Rating of volunteers' supervisors.

	Excellent	Pretty good	Fair	Poor	(Not sure)
	%	%	%	%	%
Total	51	32	11	6	(9)
Volunteers working in:					
Adult institutions	58	26	7	9	(12)
Juvenile institutions	48	33	11	8	(9)
Field agencies	57	30	11	2	(6)
Volunteer courts	33	42	16	9	(9)
Education:					
High school	59	27	11	3	(10)
College	54	33	8	5	(9)
Postgraduate	40	35	14	11	(6)

The positive rating ("excellent" plus "pretty good") is highest in field settings and lowest in volunteer courts, where the "excellent" rating is significantly lower than in other settings.

Overall, only 16 percent of the volunteers feel they do not have enough supervision. Only in volunteer courts do as many as one in five feel they do not have enough supervision.

In another question, 90 percent of the volunteers said their work was helped by the supervisor. Only 2 percent said the supervisor hindered their work.

The volunteers also have good relations with the staff. Eighty-seven percent said there was "usually good" cooperation between them and the paid professional staff. Seven percent said staff cooperation was not good, and almost as many were not sure. There was very little variation among settings.

There are two other indications of a good working relationship with the staff.

1. Each volunteer was asked:

"If you had a really worthwhile suggestion for improving a particular agency program, how good a chance do you think you would have of having this suggestion presented to and discussed by the staff?"

33. Chance of volunteer's idea being discussed by staff.

	Very good	Fairly good	Hardly any chance	Not sure
	%	%	%	%
Total	71	18	7	4
Volunteers working in:				
Adult institutions	71	17	6	6
Juvenile institutions	61	25	10	4
Field agencies	73	17	6	4
Volunteer courts	79	12	9	–
Education:				
High school	71	17	8	4
College	72	18	6	4
Postgraduate	67	21	10	2
Sex:				
Men	75	17	4	4
Women	64	20	12	4
Age:				
Under 35	62	24	12	2
35 to 49	72	18	7	3
50 and over	80	10	2	8

Seven in ten feel their idea would have a "very good chance" of being discussed. Only in juvenile institutions does this top rating sink below 70 percent.

There is some indication that men more than women, and older volunteers more than younger volunteers, believe they have the best chance of getting a hearing on their ideas.

34. Does the volunteer know what is going on or feel like an outsider?

	Knows what is going on	Feels like outsider	Not sure
	%	%	%
Total	67	21	12
Volunteers working in:			
Adult institutions	69	26	5
Juvenile institutions	54	28	18
Field agencies	73	15	12
Volunteer courts	77	10	13
Sex:			
Men	72	18	10
Women	63	24	13
Age:			
Under 35	64	23	13
35 to 49	66	23	11
50 and over	75	14	11

2. Sixty-seven percent of the volunteers said they "generally know what is going on" in their agency. Only 21 percent said they "often feel like an outsider who has little contact with what is really happening in the agency."

Once again, it is in juvenile institutions that the volunteers appear to be least involved. For the most part, the one in three who either felt like outsiders or were not sure, indicated they just did not have enough contact, through their job, with the total work of the agency. The feeling that they were being kept at arm's length by the staff was rarely stated.

Observation: Clearly, in the volunteers' view, there is an aura of harmony and closeness in the relationships with both their supervisor and with the professional staff.

The only slight suggestion of strain appears in the responses of volunteers from juvenile institutions.

Job Satisfaction

The volunteers are well satisfied with the work they have to do in the agency. A number of statistics illustrate this satisfaction.

- Eighty-seven percent feel they have the right amount of work. Nine percent feel they have too little and would like more to do. Only 4 percent feel they have too much work.
- Ninety-one percent feel their volunteer work is very interesting. Only 1 percent feel it is "not particularly interesting."
- Seventy-five percent feel their particular job is "very important" in the work of the agency. Only 2 percent feel their job is "hardly important at all."
- Ninety-two percent believe their work is appreciated by the staff of the agency.
- An identical proportion, 92 percent, believe their work is appreciated by the offenders.

35. How many volunteers are disappointed with their work?

	Most	Some	Only a few	None	Not sure
	%	%	%	%	%
Total	3	16	24	44	13
Volunteers working in:					
Adult institutions	3	10	24	54	9
Juvenile institutions	2	19	19	46	14
Field agencies	4	18	31	34	13
Volunteer courts	1	21	18	44	16
Education:					
High school	4	20	16	52	8
College	2	16	28	40	14
Postgraduate	4	15	26	41	14

As a result of these highly favorable impressions, most of the respondents feel that none or only a few of the volunteers are disappointed with the kinds of things they are doing in the agency.

Only 19 percent feel that "most" or "some" (as opposed to "only a few" or "none") of the volunteers are disappointed. In a follow-up question, we asked those who thought that at least a few volunteers are disappointed, what they believed the sources of disappointment to be. Responses are classified as follows.

	Percent of responses
Not being able to really help	15
Too restricted in assignment	14
Offenders don't respond	13
Don't see results fast enough	12
Lack of organization and coordination	11
Are too idealistic	7
Lack of interest	6
Not knowing the results	6
Situation too complex to handle	5
Not enough contact with offenders	5
No reward or praise	4
Other	20

Most of the complaints center around the difficulties of really helping the offender, of his lack of response, and of not seeing progress occur quickly enough. The job-related negatives center around assignments being too restricted, with not enough contact with the offender and lack of organization.

Are Volunteers Used Effectively?

In spite of the very positive attitude toward their agency and their job almost half of the volunteers believe they could be used more effectively.

We asked: "All in all, do you feel volunteers are being used as effectively as possible in this

36. Are volunteers used effectively?

	Used effectively	Effectiveness could be improved	Not sure
	%	%	%
Total	48	46	6
Volunteers working in:			
Adult institutions	42	47	11
Juvenile institutions	47	48	5
Field agencies	52	44	4
Volunteer courts	49	48	3
Education:			
High school	62	34	4
College	46	46	8
Postgraduate	32	63	5
Age:			
Under 35	50	47	3
35 to 49	42	49	9
50 and over	52	43	5
Professional volunteers	40	55	5

agency or do you feel there are ways that the use of volunteers can be improved?"

Particularly among those who have done graduate work and among professionals there is the feeling they could be used more effectively. The difference by setting is not great, with volunteers in adult institutions being least certain and those in field settings most certain that they are currently being used as effectively as possible.

We next asked what improvements should be made.

37. How could use of volunteers be improved?

(Base: Volunteers who said use of volunteers could be improved)

	Total
	%
Need more volunteers	21
More varied jobs	19
More contact with offenders	16
Better staff supervision	16
More cooperation with staff	10
Better training and orientation	7
Give volunteers more background on offenders he works with	7
Offer better job and education opportunities for volunteer	7
Give volunteer more responsibility and freedom	6
Other	30

Observation: The percentages shown in Table 37 represent small proportions of the total volunteer group, but the suggestions made clearly represent the basic elements of improved, more effective volunteer programs.

Attitude Toward Corrections

Repeated mention has been made of the possibility of using the volunteer as a bridge between corrections and the total community. We have said that, in terms of their acceptance of society's major responsibility for the existence of criminal behavior and of their own dedicated involvement in the correctional process, volunteers are well suited to serve in this moderating function.

Asked whether their attitude toward corrections had changed since they became volunteers in the field, two out of three (66 percent) of the volunteers said their involvement has improved their attitude toward corrections and made them feel more favorable toward the work and goals of corrections. Only one in ten (9 percent) view corrections less favorably as a result of their volunteer participation.

Volunteers were asked whether their experiences had led them to try to interest other persons in such work. Significantly, 70 percent had already sought to interest other citizens and draw them into the correctional process.

Observation: Contact with the correctional process has given most of the volunteers a new understanding and appreciation of the problems and accomplishments of correctional agencies. They have already begun to carry this message to the community.

Certainly, it can be extremely helpful to the whole correctional process to encourage volunteer involvement in the agency and the resulting advocacy in the community.

CHAPTER VII

IMPLICATIONS OF THE SURVEY FOR CORRECTIONS*

THE JOINT COMMISSION on Correctional Manpower and Training arranged for this survey in order to determine the attitudes and opinions of a small but potentially important segment of correctional manpower: the volunteers who work in many agencies throughout the country. They are important for what they actually do with and for the offender—that is, as additional manpower in a field where shortages constantly plague operations. Of equal importance is their capacity for bringing corrections and the community closer together.

It was not the object of the survey to judge the effectiveness of specific volunteer programs, much less to urge every correctional administrator to use volunteers. The case for wider use of volunteers was made by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice when its task force on corrections stated in 1967:

> One major reason why voluntary efforts should be expanded is that corrections has too long been isolated from the mainstream of community activity. The direct contact of the volunteer with the correctional system provides a means of countering this situation. It is not enough simply to increase public understanding of corrections through programs of public education. Rather, intimate personal experience with the offender has the capacity to make the volunteer an important participant in correctional work and a supporter of correctional effort.[1]

It is the purpose of this chapter to examine briefly the implications which the findings of this survey may have for the future of corrections. The question to be addressed here is not whether existing volunteer programs are good or bad, or whether agencies should develop volunteer programs. Rather it is this: If agencies wish to use volunteers, how can they do so most effectively?

Broadening the Base of Volunteerism

The demographic data gathered in this survey indicate that, by and large, volunteers in corrections come from middle-class families of better than average income. They are apt to have had more education than most other citizens. A substantial share are professional people.

These facts are all positives from the point of view of corrections. Here is a group of persons with status in the community. They appear likely to be among the opinion-makers. If their work as volunteers has given them a more favorable attitude toward corrections, as two-thirds of them said it had, they are in a position to influence the general attitudes of the community toward the problems and needs of corrections.

These facts are also positives for the offender when he returns to the community. Some of the volunteers or their friends are likely to control entry into jobs, schooling, recreation, and other activities which could be blocked by persons not in sympathy with the ex-offender's plight.

But in other ways the offender could probably profit more if volunteers were more like himself in social and economic status and thus in a better position to understand his problems. Perhaps the most striking disparity between volunteers and the offenders with whom they work is race. Negroes form a considerably higher proportion of offenders than of the general population. But only a handful of volunteers are black, and this despite the fact that, in a previous survey, more blacks than whites said they would be willing to do volunteer work *if asked*.[2] Thus it would seem obvious that a feasible way to heighten the effectiveness of volunteer programs would be to make a determined effort to recruit Negroes as volunteers, particularly residents of the ghettos from which many offenders come.

---

*This chapter was prepared by the staff of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training.

[1] President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Corrections* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 104.

[2] *The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections* (Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1968), p. 18.

This will not be an easy task, for ghetto residents often lack time for volunteer activities, and volunteers spend not only time but money to get to the site of the program. It might be useful for the correctional administrator who wants to recruit Negro volunteers to pay for carfare and other out-of-pocket expenses. This is a feature of some programs today, notably in the volunteer courts. It would also seem sensible to make contacts with Negro churches and service organizations, since volunteers tend to be members of religious and service groups.

It is obvious from the survey data that corrections does very little purposeful recruiting of any kind of volunteers. Less than one in three of those interviewed said that the correctional agency made the first contact with them. This is a situation that must be changed if agencies really want effective volunteer programs.

Moreover, it will be necessary to provide more effective screening to assure selection of persons who have capacity for the work that needs to be done. For example, less than one in five of the volunteers interviewed said they had been asked to give references, and only four in ten said they had been interviewed by an agency representative prior to entry into volunteer work. Such practices seem unlikely to result in placing the right volunteer in an assignment. They may mean that no very careful thought has been given by the agency as to what it would like volunteers to do.

Training Volunteers

Not only is the recruiting of volunteers unsystematic but training appears to be haphazard. Only half the volunteers interviewed in this survey said they had received some orientation and training when they began their work. One in five said they had had training for their current work.

It may be that the jobs which volunteers are asked to undertake are so routine or simple as to require little specific training. But volunteers need to understand some basic factors with which most of the survey respondents showed little familiarity. These are:

1. The correctional system itself—what the agency's function is and how it fits into other elements of the administration of justice; and
2. The offender, and his culture, with which many middle-class volunteers may have had no contact at all.

To give volunteers these basic understandings will of course require some didactic sessions. Equally important is learning through planned experiences and carefully supervised participation in beginning tasks. The volunteer will have to learn to listen to the offenders he will be serving. In feedback sessions with the trainer, he can examine his experience and test his perceptions.

The very fact that many volunteers interviewed in this survey seemed to feel no need for training in order to work effectively with a group largely unknown to them is clear indication that training must be planned carefully and carried out in the same fashion.

Utilization of Volunteers

The majority of volunteers interviewed in this survey worked directly with the offender. They were involved in self-help programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous, in recreation, in religious activities, and in arts and crafts.

Others were engaged in aide roles in counseling, guidance, and testing at intake. In the majority of such cases, the volunteer acts as part of a team, working in conjunction with the professional staff member and complementing his role.

Well over half the volunteers interviewed were supervised by a staff member who had other duties as well. Twelve percent were supervised only by another volunteer.

Only 16 percent were supervised by a staff member whose sole responsibility was coordination of volunteers' activities. For a volunteer program to function properly, it is often necessary that a staff member have responsibility for coordination of such tasks as recruitment, orientation and training, job assignment and supervision, and that such coordination should be his major responsibility. It is too much to expect a staff member already overburdened with a large caseload to handle a volunteer program. Invariably, the program suffers. There is increasing interest in the field of corrections, however, in setting up a staff position of coordinator of volunteers. And as the use of volunteers increases, more professionals will need training in how to work with them.

Agency Commitment to a Volunteer Program

It is obvious that an effective volunteer program requires a commitment on the part of the agency. Assignment of staff to recruitment, training, and supervision of volunteers is essential if an agency is seriously interested in tapping this resource. Small stipends to cover volunteers' expenses may be useful.

Thus the program will not be cost-free. The administrator must make the decision as to whether the benefits exceed the cost.

The Volunteer and Support for Corrections

One potential benefit of an effective volunteer program can hardly be measured in dollars and cents.

This is the gain in public understanding of corrections which can come from the participation of volunteers in the program of a correctional agency. It is widely recognized that corrections has failed to convince the community that it is an essential public service; it has done very little to let the people know about its problems and its successes. But the enthusiastic volunteer who does understand these things from his experience with offenders can bring home to his friends and the community at large what corrections is and does. Other public services have found that one enthusiastic volunteer is worth three professionals as a missionary for their work.

Community understanding and support are perhaps even more important to corrections than to many other public services. For the ability of released offenders to fit into normal community life is the real test of whether corrections has succeeded or failed with them. Thus volunteers, as citizens who can help to smooth the ex-offender's way back to the free society, contribute not only to the welfare of individuals but also to the viability of corrections, now and in future.

APPENDIX

NOTES ON METHODOLOGY OF THE SURVEY

These notes form an addendum to the general description of methodology given in Chapter I above.

Substantive Areas Examined

In this survey four different areas were covered.

1. ***Who are the volunteers?***
What are the experiential, educational and demographic characteristics of the volunteers? What, if any, are their organizational affiliations?

In what characteristic ways do the volunteers differ from the general public and from correctional personnel?

2. ***Why are they volunteers?***
To what extent have these individuals participated in previous volunteer activities? Are they currently doing volunteer work in other areas beside corrections? How long have they been volunteers?

What are the most important reasons for volunteering? What are the motivating factors which trigger and encourage volunteerism?

What do volunteers feel are the main reasons an individual turns to crime? How do their attitudes in this area differ from those of the general public and from correctional personnel?

Are there any special concerns or fears the volunteers may have had about working in corrections?

3. ***Volunteer work in the correctional agency.***
Before beginning work in the agency how much knowledge did the volunteer have about corrections?

How did the volunteer first hear about the particular agency in which he is placed?

Did he volunteer as an individual or as part of a group?

Who made the initial contact? Was it the volunteer (or his group) or was it the correctional agency?

How long has the volunteer been in the correctional agency? How often does he go and how long does he stay on each visit?

Were there any special requirements for becoming a correctional volunteer? Was there any initial screening of volunteers?

Was there an orientation period when the volunteer first began work in the agency and, if so, what did it consist of and how worthwhile was it?

What kind of work is the volunteer now doing? What proportion of volunteers work directly with the offender?

Did the volunteer receive any specific training for the job he is now performing?

What is the supervisory structure within which the volunteer works?

4. ***Attitudes toward volunteer work in the correctional agency.***
What do the volunteers think are the actual goals of the agency in which they are working? How do they compare with what they feel the goals should be?

What proportion of the offenders do they feel are really helped by the agency?

How would they rate the volunteer program in their agency? How well organized is the program?

How do they feel about the supervision they receive? Is there too much, too little, or just enough supervision?

What are their relations with the correctional staff? Do they find the staff cooperative or not?

Do they have a sense of participation in the agency, of knowing what is going on, of being able to make suggestions which will be listened to?

How much interest do they have in their volunteer job and do they feel their work is important and appreciated by the staff as well as by offenders?

How many volunteers do they feel are disappointed with the work they are doing and what are the sources of this disappointment?

What improvements, if any, would they suggest in the volunteer program in their agency?

Finally, have their experiences changed their attitude toward the correctional field? Do they view corrections more favorably or less favorably than they did before they became correctional volunteers?

Subgroups within the Sample

As noted in Chapter I, interviews were completed with 541 volunteers working in four settings.

1. ***Settings***
   - Adult institutions (152 individuals)
   - Juvenile institutions (143 individuals)
   - Field agencies (184 individuals), including respondents in both adult and juvenile settings, with the majority in the juvenile area.
   - Volunteer courts (62 individuals)—respondents working directly for a court system. These volunteers were working in both adult and juvenile courts, but the majority were working with juveniles.

2. ***Education of volunteers***[1]
   - High school or less (140)—includes all respondents who had not gone to college.

[1] Not all those interviewed responded to this item on the questionnaire.

College (265)—all respondents who had attended college. They might have graduated, but no one in this group had done any graduate work.

Postgraduate (126)—respondents who had had some graduate work, including those with master's and doctor's degrees.

3. ***Sex of volunteers***

Men (285)
Women (265)

4. ***Age of volunteers***

Under 35 (189)
35 to 49 (217)
50 and over (135)

5. ***Selected occupation***

Respondents referred to in this report as professionals (132 in all) were those who indicated that they were working in the community as doctors, lawyers, teachers, and other occupations normally designated as professions.

THE COMMISSION

James V. Bennett, *President*

E. B. Whitten
Vice-President

E. Preston Sharp
Secretary-Treasurer

Board of Directors

Milton G. Rector
Chairman

Peter P. Lejins
Vice-Chairman

James V. Bennett
Daniel Blain
Charles B. Brink
Raymond Feldman
Dale B. Harris
Elmer H. Johnson
Richard A. McGee
Russell G. Oswald
Arnulf M. Pins
Walter C. Reckless
Howard P. Rome
Mrs. Thomas Scales
Clyde E. Sullivan
Randolph E. Wise
Luther W. Youngdahl

General Counsel

Warren E. Magee

Officers of the Membership

Ellis C. MacDougall
Chairman

Earl H. Hanson[1]
Vice-Chairman

Charles L. Newman, *Secretary*

THE STAFF

Garrett Heyns
Executive Director

Benjamin Frank
Program Director

Rudy Sanfilippo[2]
Associate Director

Roma K. McNickle
Editor

Edward T. Magoffin, Jr.
Controller, Director of Legal Studies

Lillian Kharasch
Editorial Assistant

Task Force Directors

John J. Galvin[3]
Merritt Gilman[4]
William Meredith[5]
Keith A. Stubblefield
Jo Wallach

Assistant Directors

Steve Bulfinch
David Halferty
Loren Karacki
Alice Maxwell
James Lynch

Research Associate

Martha L. Haller

---

[1] Deceased August 22, 1968.
[2] Appointed December 16, 1968, following the resignation of William T. Adams.
[3] Resigned October 29, 1968.
[4] Deceased September 5, 1968.
[5] Resigned December 1, 1968.